

II. Remarks

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 7 are being amended. Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

The claim language of claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention as disclosed in the subject application. Claim 1 now recites details of the fixing screw head and shaft. The fixing screw is recited as being inserted through the fixing hole formed by a bore. Details of the configuration of the fixing hole are also recited. Amended claim 1 further recites a plurality of grooves distributed about the circumference of the bore which receive fixing arms of the adapter to mount the adapter to the guide element. Moreover, amended claim 1 further describes the adapter having a displacement body which blocks a portion of the guide slit when the adapter is mounted to the guide element to limit the slit height of the guide slit. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Responsive to the rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP404113960A to Maekawa et al. (*Maekawa*), *Maekawa* does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention. For example, claim 1 recites a plurality of grooves distributed about the circumference of the bore through which fixing arms of the adapter extend to mount the adapter to the guide element. Contrarily, what the Examiner refers to as a fixing arm 105, in *Maekawa*, does not extend through the adapter to mount the adapter to the guide element as disclosed in amended claim 1. Rather, the inclined pressure receiving face 105 of *Maekawa* receives pressure from a correspondingly shaped inclined pressurized plate 94 to

separate the lock plate 54 from the cutout part 40 of the guide rail 12. Further, the adapter is mounted to the guide element by fixing arms 88, 102, which do not extend through a plurality of grooves, but are located outside the opening 104. Accordingly, *Maekawa* does not disclose a plurality of grooves distributed about the circumference of the bore through which fixing arms of the adapter extend to mount the adapter to the guide element.

Further, claim 1 recites an adapter having a displacement body which blocks a portion of the guide slit when the adapter is mounted to the guide element, thereby limiting the slit height of the guide slit. Contrarily, *Maekawa* does not disclose an adapter having a displacement body. In fact, there is no part of the adapter which blocks a portion of the guide slit when the adapter is mounted to the guide element.

Accordingly, since *Maekawa* fails to teach each and every element of claim 1, reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and the allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested. Further, *Maekawa* fails to suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. Therefore, the claimed invention would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of *Maekawa* and its deficiencies. Moreover, since claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, directly or indirectly, the reasons for allowance of claim 1 apply as well to the dependent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-7 are patentably distinguishable over the art of record. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

January 17, 2008

Date

Respectfully submitted,


Steven L. Oberholtzer (Reg. No. 30,670)